

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Official Action mailed on April 16, 2008. This response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7-12 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Webjörn et al.

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Batchko et al. (US 2002/0179912).

The above rejections are respectfully traversed as being improper. First, claim 5 had been canceled so there is no claim 5 to reject. Second, in the rejection Examiner states that in both Webjörn et al. and Batchko et al. the frequency converter comprises a non-linear crystal placed within a cavity, and the common cavity is pumped by said polarized beams. This is respectfully traversed. Both Webjörn et al. and Batchko et al. each use a PPLN waveguide. Webjörn et al. specifically says the PPLN waveguide is made “using standard E-field poling and annealed proton exchange techniques”. Batchko et al. uses a PPLN waveguide as stated in paragraph 32, and states in several places that the waveguide and optics are “integrated into a monolithic optical structure”. Thus, neither of the cited references contemplates using a frequency converter that comprises a non-linear crystal placed within a common cavity, and that the common cavity is pumped by the polarized beams.

Examiner says the waveguides are a common cavity. It is respectfully pointed out that a waveguide is not an optical cavity. Quoting from en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Optical_cavity “An optical cavity or optical resonator is an arrangement of mirrors that forms a standing wave cavity resonator for light waves. Optical cavities are a major component of lasers, surrounding the gain medium and providing feedback of the laser light. They are also used in optical parametric oscillators and some interferometers.” In contrast, an optical waveguide is not an optical cavity – it is not an optical resonator and is not an arrangement of mirrors that forms a standing wave cavity resonator for light waves.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that none of the prior art, taken singly or in combination, provides the claimed features of claims 1 and 7. Please note that during the PCT stage of this national phase application, the PCT Written Opinion (submitted herewith as evidence) also confirmed that this feature is not found in the art cited by the Examiner.

Claims 2 and 10-13 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 6-9 are respectfully deemed allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DEKEL PATENT LTD.



David Klein, Patent Agent
Reg. No. 41,118
Tel +972-8-949-5334
Fax +972-8-949-5323
E-mail dekelltd@netvision.net.il